

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA
MACON DIVISION**

Robert CARSWELL, et. al.,)
)
Plaintiffs,)
)
v.) CIVIL ACTION NO. 5:10-CV-183 (MTT)
)
STATE OF GEORGIA, et. al.,)
)
Defendants.)
)

ORDER

This matter is before the Court on the Plaintiffs' Motion for Reconsideration (Doc. 4) (the "Motion"). Motions for Reconsideration are not to be filed as a matter of routine practice. M.D. Ga. Local R. 7.6. "Reconsideration is appropriate only if the movant demonstrates that: (1) there has been an intervening change in the law, (2) new evidence has been discovered that was not previously available to the parties at the time the original order was entered, or (3) reconsideration is necessary to correct a clear error of law or prevent manifest injustice." *Talley v. Housing Auth. of Columbus*, 2010 WL 339817, at *1 (M.D. Ga. 2010). The Plaintiffs argue the Court should reconsider the Order because defense attorneys in prior cases accepted bribes and/or were negligent, but this action was dismissed for frivolity and failure to state a claim.

Accordingly, because the Plaintiffs failed to demonstrate the Order was erroneous, the Motion is **DENIED**.

SO ORDERED, this the 29th day of March, 2011.

S/ Marc T. Treadwell
MARC T. TREADWELL, JUDGE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT